

Numerical investigation of iso-spectral cavities built from triangles

Hua Wu and D. W. L. Sprung

Department of Physics and Astronomy, McMaster University

Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4M1 Canada

J. Martorell

Dept. d'Estructura i Constituents de la Materia, Facultat Física,

University of Barcelona, Barcelona 08028, Spain

(July 1994)

Abstract

We present computational approaches as alternatives to the recent microwave cavity experiment by S. Sridhar and A. Kudrolli (Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2175 (1994)) on iso-spectral cavities built from triangles. A straightforward proof of iso-spectrality is given based on the mode matching method. Our results show that the experiment is accurate to 0.3% for the first 25 states. The level statistics resemble those of GOE when the integrable part of the spectrum is removed.

03.65.Ge, 05.45+b, 02.90+p

I. INTRODUCTION

In a well-known paper, M. Kac [1] raised the question of whether two isospectral plane domains must actually be isometric. This is popularly phrased as “Can one hear the shape of a drum?”. From the physics viewpoint, since the density of states has an asymptotic expansion whose coefficients depend on the area, perimeter, ... of the cavity, it is clear that at least these properties must be common, but this leaves open the question of whether the two must be identical in all respects. The question has now received a definitive negative answer. C. Gordon and collaborators [2] have given simple examples constructed out of seven right triangles which are isospectral but not isometric.

These particular shapes were subjected to experimental test by Sridhar and Kudrolli [3], and found to give identical spectra to an accuracy of 0.2% on average for the first 25 eigen-energies. In this paper we present accurate numerical results with the mode matching and with a finite difference method. The agreement between the two kinds of calculation ensures the accuracy of the results. Compared to the experimental spectra, we find differences of order 0.3%.

In addition a very simple proof of the iso-spectrality is obtained with the mode matching method. The wavefunction transformation from one cavity to the other is put into a simple form. We find that our computed wavefunction is in good qualitative agreement with the experimental wavefunction. The level statistics resemble those of GOE when a subset of integrable levels are removed.

In section 2 we outline the mode-matching method for the two cavities, and in section 3 we demonstrate iso-spectrality analytically. Section 4 contains the numerical results and conclusions.

II. THE MODE MATCHING METHOD

The problem we wish to solve is Helmholtz’s equation

$$(\nabla^2 + E)\Psi = 0 \quad (1)$$

in the interior of regions shown in Fig. 1 with Dirichlet conditions on the boundaries. Each cavity consists of 7 equal sided right triangles. Let the length of a short side of a triangle be the unit length d . Since the cavities are made from regular shapes, we can divide them into smaller regions as shown in Fig. 1. We will first concentrate on cavity one. The five smaller regions are three triangles labelled as A, B, and E, and two squares labelled as C and D. We shall write Ψ_{AB} etc. for wavefunction values along the internal boundary lines separating the regions. Then the auxiliary boundary conditions on the smaller regions are conveniently written by expanding these wavefunctions in the Fourier series:

$$\Psi_{AB} = \sum_n A_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi x}{d} \quad , \quad (2)$$

$$\Psi_{BC} = \sum_n B_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \quad , \quad (3)$$

$$\Psi_{CD} = \sum_n C_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \quad , \quad (4)$$

$$\Psi_{DE} = \sum_n D_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(x-2d)}{d} \quad . \quad (5)$$

Here $A_{1n} \dots D_{1n}$ are mode expansion coefficients, the subscript 1 denotes cavity one, and the summation over n is from 1 to N , a value truncating the infinite series summation. We shall now see that if these auxiliary boundary conditions are assumed to be known, the wavefunctions in each region are easily determined as long as the energy does not happen to coincide with an eigen-energy of the small closed region. The wavefunction for the square region is easy to work out, and thanks to the 45° of the triangle, the wavefunction for the triangle is just that of a square, plus antisymmetrization along the diagonal line. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A = \sum_n A_{1n} \Big[& \sin \frac{n\pi x}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(3d-y)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\ & - \sin \frac{n\pi(y-2d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \Big] \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\Psi_B = \sum_n A_{1n} \Big[\sin \frac{n\pi x}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(y-d)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \Big]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sin \frac{n\pi(2d-y)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \Big] \\
& + \sum B_{1n} \Big[\sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n x}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\
& - \sin \frac{n\pi(d-x)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-y)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \Big] \quad , \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_C &= \sum_n B_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\
&+ \sum_n C_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(x-d)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \quad , \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_D &= \sum_n C_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(3d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\
&+ \sum_n D_{1n} \sin \frac{n\pi(x-2d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-y)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \quad , \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_E &= \sum_n D_{1n} \Big[\sin \frac{n\pi(x-2d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n y}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\
&- \sin \frac{n\pi y}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(x-2d)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \Big] \quad , \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha_n = \sqrt{E - \left(\frac{n\pi}{d}\right)^2} \quad . \tag{11}$$

By construction, these wavefunctions are already continuous across the boundary lines. The mode expansion coefficients are now determined by requiring the normal derivatives to be continuous as well. A straightforward calculation gives the following condition:

$$M_1 \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ B_1 \\ C_1 \\ D_1 \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad , \tag{12}$$

with

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} U - 2W & \overline{W} - \overline{V}/2 & 0 & 0 \\ \overline{W} - \overline{V}/2 & U - W & -V/2 & 0 \\ 0 & -V/2 & U & W \\ 0 & 0 & W & U - \overline{W} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where U, V, W are $N \times N$ matrices with elements defined by:

$$U_{m,n} = \delta_{m,n} \alpha_n \cot \alpha_n d, \quad (14)$$

$$V_{m,n} = \delta_{m,n} \alpha_n / \sin \alpha_n d, \quad (15)$$

and

$$W_{m,n} = \frac{(m\pi/d)(n\pi/d)}{E - (m\pi/d)^2 - (n\pi/d)^2}. \quad (16)$$

Defining the diagonal matrix P of order N , as $P_{n,n} = (-1)^n$, then

$$\overline{W} = PWP, \quad \overline{V} = PV. \quad (17)$$

In Eq. (12), A_1 etc. are column matrices of order N with A_{1n} etc. as their elements.

Normally, one would look for non-trivial solutions to Eq. (12) by seeking energies for which $\det(M_1) = 0$. A better way is to diagonalize M_1 first. Then, when scanning in energy a zero eigenvalue is found, this energy corresponds to an eigen-mode of the cavity and the corresponding eigenvector gives rise to the wavefunction. When $\det(M_1) \neq 0$, the wavefunctions, eqs. (2) to (5), on the internal boundaries vanish and the only possible non-trivial solutions are when the energy coincides with one of the eigen-energies of the smaller regions themselves. Thus besides the solutions dictated by $\det(M_1) = 0$, other solutions exist at the eigen-energies of the basic triangle, which are known analytically. The wavefunctions in the several triangles must be in proper phase to make the normal derivatives across the boundary lines continuous, and that fixes the relative sign in each small region.

In a totally parallel way, the condition for finding eigen-energies for the second cavity is (see appendix A):

$$M_2 \begin{bmatrix} A_2 \\ B_2 \\ C_2 \\ D_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad (18)$$

with

$$M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} U - W & \overline{W} - \overline{V}/2 & 0 & 0 \\ \overline{W} - \overline{V}/2 & U - W & \overline{V}/2 & W \\ 0 & \overline{V}/2 & U - W & \overline{W} \\ 0 & W & \overline{W} & U - W \end{bmatrix} . \quad (19)$$

The mode matching method is essentially an analytical one, though it requires numerical diagonalization and root searching. It yields fast convergence with respect to the truncation parameter N . As will be further discussed in the next section, even after truncation the numerical spectra of the two cavities are identical, so that comparing them does not give any additional check on the accuracy of the numerical results. Therefore, as a further check we performed a more conventional calculation using a finite difference method for the purpose of comparison and testing of results. The implementation is trivial: one replaces the Laplace operator in eq.1 with a five point difference formula, and eigen-energies and wavefunctions are obtained in one single diagonalization step.

III. ISOSPECTRALITY

The theorems proved by Gordon *et al.* [2] ensure that the two cavities have the same spectra. The experimental work of Ref. [3] entailed some error in comparing the two spectra. We shall now discuss how well the numerical computations presented here confirm the isospectrality theorem. With the same grid size, we find that the finite difference method gives exactly the same spectra (up to machine precision) for the two cavities. Thus, even for a finite grid size, and although the method is an approximation to the real cavities, isospec-

trality is always precise. The same property holds for the mode matching method. To prove this, we notice that the matrices M_1 and M_2 are connected by an orthogonal transformation

$$T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & P \\ 1 & 0 & P & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & P \\ -1 & 0 & P & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

$$M_1 = T^t M_2 T \quad . \quad (21)$$

This proves that the determinants of M_1 and M_2 have the same set of zeros, and therefore produce the same spectra. In addition, substituting Eq. (21) into Eq. (12)

$$M_2 T \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ B_1 \\ C_1 \\ D_1 \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad . \quad (22)$$

Thus the wavefunctions in the two cavities are connected by

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_2 \\ B_2 \\ C_2 \\ D_2 \end{bmatrix} = T \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ B_1 \\ C_1 \\ D_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad . \quad (23)$$

This relationship is consistent with Eq. 1 of Ref. [3], but has a more compact and easily accessible form. It is valid for arbitrary truncation number N . By taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have an alternative proof of the isospectrality of these two cavities, which uses tools more familiar to the physicist. Clearly, the two cavities represent the same quantum problem, but in different representations.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since our computations yield exactly the same energies for the two cavities, only one spectrum is presented. There is a subset of levels, those of the unit triangle, which are

analytically known, and these have to be added to the zeros of $\det(M_1)$. Introducing an energy unit $E_u = (\pi/d)^2$, the eigen-energies of a unit square are $(n_x^2 + n_y^2)E_u$. For a unit triangle, due to the antisymmetrization requirement, the allowed eigen-energies are the same with the restriction $n_x > n_y$, with corresponding wavefunction

$$\Psi_{n_x, n_y} = \sin \frac{n_x \pi x}{d} \sin \frac{n_y \pi y}{d} - \sin \frac{n_x \pi y}{d} \sin \frac{n_y \pi x}{d} \quad (24)$$

The first two such states are at $5E_u$, and $10E_u$ which correspond to modes $(n_x, n_y) = (2, 1)$ and $(3, 1)$. Comparing with the experimental or calculated spectrum, they are the 9th and 21st states. In Fig. 2 we plot these two states, revealing their triangular nature. Because these states are analytically known, and are observed experimentally, they can be used to calibrate the experiment.

There are degenerate states within the set of triangular states. The first two-fold degenerate pair appears at $E = 65E_u$ with modes $(7, 4)$ and $(8, 1)$. Aside from the triangular states, numerical results show there are no other degenerate states up to the 600th level.

Table 1 lists 25 levels from the experiment of Ref. [3] and from our calculation. Column 1 is simply the state sequential number. All the energies are in units of E_u . The second and the third columns (Cavity 1 and Cavity 2) are obtained from the measured frequencies of Table 1 of Ref. [3] with the conversion formula $E/E_u = (2fd/c)^2 = 0.25842(f/GHz)^2$. If the experiment were done with air in the cavity as the normal condition, the conversion factor would be multiplied by 1.0006. Table 1 assumes this situation. These two sets of data agree with an average percentage error 0.2%.

The fourth column (F.D.) is the result from finite differences. Calculations for grid sizes $h = d/30, d/40, d/50$, were found to vary quadratically with grid size h . Richardson extrapolation to the limit gives accurate eigenvalues.

The last column (M.M.) is the result from our mode matching method. Results were found to vary linearly in the variable $1/N$. Values from $N = 50$ and $N = 60$ were extrapolated linearly to $N \rightarrow \infty$. Comparing F.D. with M.M., the error is 0.02%. This small error probably comes primarily from the finite difference method. Comparing the mode matching

method with either cavity's experimental data shows the difference is 0.3% on average. Thus the two computational results agree by one order of magnitude better than the agreement between theory and experiment. Fig. 3 shows the percentage error relative to the mode matching method $(E/E_{M.M.} - 1)$. It reveals both statistical and systematic error in the data. It should be noticed that due to the upward trend in the data, an overall scaling to the energy, which may account for overall dimensional error, will not dramatically reduce the experimental-theoretical difference. It would be interesting to understand the source of the difference between theory and the data.

One of the highlighted points of Ref. [3] was the ability to measure the wavefunction. Fig. 4 plots the 1st, 3rd and the 6th wavefunctions which show qualitative agreement with experiment. Our more accurate wavefunctions may be useful in further study on the problem of classical-quantum correspondence.

We computed the level statistics for the first 600 states as shown in Fig. 5. The actual spectrum was unfolded using the average density of states obtained from Weyl's formula as given by Ref. [3]. One sees excellent agreement with the quantum spectrum. Although both cavities are pseudo-integrable systems [4], the statistics are closer to GOE than to Poisson. As we have pointed out, there are degeneracies among the eigenstates of the unit triangle. This part of the spectrum is fully integrable. Separating them from the whole spectrum, the level statistics of the remainder is now very much like that of GOE, a type of level statistics often associated with non-integrable systems [5].

In summary, we have presented numerical calculations for the isospectral problem in domains constructed from right angle 45° triangles. We found accurate theoretical results which confirm the experiment and give an absolute reference to the data. We point out a subset of eigen-states which are analytically solvable and can be used to calibrate the experiment. The mode matching method also yields a simple analytical proof of isospectrality.

APPENDIX A: MODE MATCHING FORMULA FOR CAVITY 2

The auxiliary boundary values are expanded as:

$$\Psi_{AB} = \sum_n A_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi x}{d} \quad , \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\Psi_{BC} = \sum_n B_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \quad , \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\Psi_{CD} = \sum_n C_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi(2d-y)}{d} \quad , \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\Psi_{CE} = \sum_n D_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi(x-d)}{d} \quad . \quad (\text{A4})$$

Then:

$$\Psi_A = \sum_n A_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi x}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(3d-y)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \quad , \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_B = \sum_n A_{2n} & \left[\sin \frac{n\pi x}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(y-d)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right. \\ & \left. - \sin \frac{n\pi(2d-y)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right] \\ & + \sum_n B_{2n} \left[\sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n x}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right. \\ & \left. - \sin \frac{n\pi(d-x)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-y)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right] \quad , \quad (\text{A6}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_C = \sum_n B_{2n} & \sin \frac{n\pi(y-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\ & + \sum_n C_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi(2d-y)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(x-d)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \\ & + \sum_n D_{2n} \sin \frac{n\pi(x-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-y)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \quad , \quad (\text{A7}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_D = \sum_n C_{2n} & \left[\sin \frac{n\pi(2d-y)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(3d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right. \\ & \left. - \sin \frac{n\pi(x-2d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(y-d)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right] \quad , \quad (\text{A8}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_E = \sum_n D_{2n} & \left[\sin \frac{n\pi(x-d)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n y}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right. \\ & \left. - \sin \frac{n\pi(d-y)}{d} \frac{\sin \alpha_n(2d-x)}{\sin \alpha_n d} \right] \quad , \quad (\text{A9}) \end{aligned}$$

Matching normal derivatives:

$$\int_0^d \sin \frac{m\pi x}{d} \left[\frac{\partial \Psi_B}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \Psi_A}{\partial y} \right]_{y=2d} = 0 \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\int_d^{2d} \sin \frac{m\pi(y-d)}{d} \left[\frac{\partial \Psi_B}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \Psi_C}{\partial x} \right]_{x=d} = 0 \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$\int_d^{2d} \sin \frac{m\pi(y-d)}{d} \left[\frac{\partial \Psi_C}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \Psi_D}{\partial x} \right]_{x=2d} = 0 \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\int_d^{2d} \sin \frac{m\pi(x-d)}{d} \left[\frac{\partial \Psi_C}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \Psi_E}{\partial y} \right]_{y=d} = 0 \quad (\text{A13})$$

Allowing m to run from 1 to N , Eqs. (A10)–(A13) give rise to Eq. (18).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Kac, Am. Math. Monthly, **73** (1966) 1.
- [2] C. Gordon, D. Webb and S. Wolpert, Invent. Math. **110** (1992) 1-22
- [3] S. Sridhar and A. Kudrolli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** (1994) 2175-8.
- [4] P. J. Richens and M. V. Berry, Physica **2D**, 495 (1981).
- [5] O. Bohigas, M. J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1 (1984).

TABLES

TABLE I. The first 25 eigen-values from the experiment of Ref. [3] and from our numerical calculations.

n	Cavity 1	Cavity 2	F. D.	M. M.
1	1.02471	1.02481	1.02893 58	1.02853 50
2	1.46899	1.47194	1.48186 54	1.48146 72
3	2.08738	2.08831	2.09824 94	2.09746 74
4	2.64079	2.63985	2.64971 54	2.64954 66
5	2.93297	2.92949	2.93817 62	2.93743 35
6	3.72675	3.71892	3.73268 94	3.73233 41
7	4.28393	4.28388	4.29519 27	4.29472 78
8	4.67021	4.66917	4.67766 52	4.67753 22
9	4.98838	4.98531	5.00000 19	5.00000 00
10	5.27908	5.27278	5.29147 53	5.29027 51
11	5.78755	5.78371	5.80153 08	5.80113 84
12	6.41357	6.43781	6.43389 42	6.43215 56
13	6.84891	6.84718	6.86626 01	6.86622 62
14	7.15242	7.16045	7.15980 24	7.15934 32
15	7.67783	7.70604	7.69473 74	7.69241 71
16	8.44285	8.45947	8.46365 45	8.46325 68
17	8.57859	8.62220	8.61353 59	8.61116 89
18	8.99495	8.97209	9.01240 54	9.01034 93
19	9.60312	9.59562	9.60996 82	9.60979 08
20	9.92583	9.93689	9.92113 11	9.92103 96
21	10.00330	10.03932	10.00000 76	10.00000 00
22	10.55227	10.55740	10.57102 01	10.56973 65
23	11.09578	11.10035	11.06691 65	11.06572 72

24	11.41874	11.40569	11.41955 09	11.41884 99
25	11.99364	11.98033	11.98464 97	11.98408 03

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Geometric shapes of the two two-dimensional domains with identical spectra. The dotted lines are boundary lines dividing the cavities into smaller regions.

FIG. 2. Contour plot of wavefunctions for the 9th (the top row) and the 21st (bottom row) states which are eigen-states of a closed unit triangle. The 21st state is exactly the doubling of the 9th state.

FIG. 3. Percentage error relative to the mode matching method. Finite difference method (stars); experimental values: Cavity 1 (triangles), cavity 2 (squares).

FIG. 4. Contour plot of the wavefunctions for states 1, 3, and 6, which correspond to the measured wavefunctions in Fig. 2 of Ref. [3].

FIG. 5. Nearest level spacing distribution $P(X)$ and Δ_3 statistics of the spectrum. The upper panel is for the full set of the first 600 states. The bottom panel is after the triangular states were removed. Also plotted are Wigner and Poisson distribution curves.









